

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.06.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

Cr.L.O.P.No.8225 of 2020

T.Anbarasu

... Petitioners

Vs.

State By:

The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, S.P. Office,
Krishnagiri District.
(Cr.No. 3 OF 2020)

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. to enlarge the petitioners on bail pending investigation in Crime No.3 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Pugalenth

For Respondent : Mr.Mohammed Riyaz

Additional Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY
ORDER

The petitioner/A1, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Section 419, 420, 468, 471 & 120 B of IPC, in Crime No.3 of 2020, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the Proprietor of a concern and the accused persons are the employees. The petitioner is ranked as A1. The trade license of the defacto complainant was cancelled in the year 2014 and thereafter, he once again obtained another trade license in the year 2018 and he is running the business. On verification of his accounts, the defacto complainant found that a sum of Rs.66,33,770/- was misappropriated by the accused persons.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent police submitted that upon verification, it was found that the petitioner had created the document by affixing his photographs in the trade license and thereby opened an account with the Tamil Nadu Mercantile bank and he has encashed the money which was actually paid to the defacto complainant by a company called as Venkateswara Private Limited. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner has misappropriated materials worth Rs.20,00 000/- and also machines worth Rs.2.5 lakhs.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is also a partner in the concern and the complaint itself has been given very belatedly with ulterior motives.

5. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the seriousness of the allegations made against the petitioner and since the investigation is pending, this Court is not inclined to grant Anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

08.06.2020

Internet : Yes/No

rka

To.

1. The Principal Sessions Court,
Krishnagiri.
2. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.1, Krishnagiri.
3. The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch, S.P. Office,
Krishnagiri District
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

N.ANAND VENKATESH,J

rka



Crl.O.P.No.8225 of 2020

WEB COPY

08.06.2020